

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 are currently pending in the present application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Win et al.* (US 6,182,142) in view of *Shrader et al.* (US 6,374,359). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 10) recites a step of "storing a encryption key pair having a private key and a public key in a protected storage device within said data processing system" and a step of "in response to the receipt of a cookie generated by an application from a remote server, encrypting said cookie with said public key." Thus, according to the claimed invention, in response to the receipt of a cookie originated from a remote server, a data processing system encrypts the cookie with a public key previously stored within the data processing system.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the encrypting step was disclosed by *Win* in col. 6, lines 51-56. But according to *Win*, the encryption of a cookie is performed by an Authentication Client Module within an access server 108 (col. 6, lines 48-55). Since *Win* teaches the encryption of a cookie is performed within a server instead of a data processing system remotely located from the server, the claimed encrypting step is distinguished from the teachings of *Win*.

Also, Claim 1 recites a step of "storing said encrypted cookie in a non-protected storage device within said data processing system." On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed storing step is disclosed by *Win* in Figure 5C. Figures 5A-5E of *Win* are state diagrams depicting the steps carried out within an access server such as access server 106 shown in Figure 4 (col. 3, line 64 - col. 4, line 7). Hence, even if the storing of cookies in a memory was disclosed by *Win*, *Win* was referring to the storing of cookies in a server and not in a data processing system, as claimed. *Shrader* does not teach or suggest the claimed storing step either.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not found in the cited references, whether considered separately or in combination, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-7 and 10-16 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 10 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
P.O. Box 201720
Austin, Texas 78720-1720
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS